DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 427 SP 030 841

AUTHOR Arnault, Lynne S.; Black, Dorothy A.
TITLE Preparing Preservice Teachers To Teach Secondary Aged Students with Handicaps.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Louisville, KY, November 9-11, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Individual Characteristics; *Job Satisfaction; *Learning Disabilities; Rural Youth; Secondary Education; *Vocational Adjustment; *Work Attitudes; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS Beginning Work Rating Scale

ABSTRACT

This study compared beginning work attitudes of learning disabled (LD) workers and nondisabled workers to see if any differences exist in the areas of social, emotional, or work ability. The population was comprised of 30 subjects, all of whom were recent high school graduates who have had some type of work experience. Half of the subjects were students who were ruled as LD and half were considered normal in ability and achievement. Each participant completed the Beginning Work Rating Scale. The findings revealed few significant differences between the two groups in the areas of social/emotional, self-evaluation, work habits, and work interests. However, LD workers displayed characteristics that may be sources of unsuccessful job placement and performance: (1) conflicts with co-workers; (2) arguing with co-workers; (3) talking back to the supervisor; (4) frequent absenteeism; and (5) job frustrations. Data from the study are presented in narrative and tabular form and a copy of the Beginning Work Rating Scale questionnaire is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303427

Preparing Preservice Teachers to Teach Secondary Aged Students with Handicaps

Lynne S. Arnault

Mississippi State University

Dorothy A. Black

Choctaw County (MS) Public Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L.S. Arnault

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the 1988 Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Louisville, KY, November, 1988

SP030841

Preparing Preservice Teachers to Teach Secondary Aged Students with Handicaps

As learning disabled (LD) persons enter adulthood, the same problems they encountered in the past do not go away. There is no "magic bullet" to make life easier. Although this fact is well known, in the past, little emphasis has been placed on finding ways to help the LD adult cope with his situation and succeed in his social and vocational experiences. Attitudes of those dealing with the student, lack of adequate educational programming, and poor transition to work programs have hindered the LD student's progression to adulthood. This study focuses on the above issues and how they can affect the LD adult.

According to Lerner (1981), when the LD programs began in the early 1960s, the emphasis was placed on developing programs for the young child. Many researchers felt that if they could identify the LD child at a young age, before he failed, and provide appropriate interventions, this could provide the "magic bullet," or at least improve the child's outlook dramatically.

As time went on, the programs expanded, considering the needs of the junior high and secondary aged groups. Much research has been done in teaching procedures, learning models, etc., for working with this particular group. The pressures put on secondary schools since the 1970s to find better ways to serve the

secondary aged LD adolescent have been tremendous. Unlike programs dealing with other disabilities, much of the work has been done in a very short time with not much emphasis on effectiveness (Alley & Deshler, 1979).

Due to the eagerness of researchers to find the "magic bullet," many programs have been set up for this group that have hindered more than helped. Many of the programs have merely been extensions of elementary aged service models. Other models used have been alternative, watered down approaches similar to those used with mentally retarded populations which deny the potential these students have for normal functioning and adjustment (Alley & Deshler, 1979).

All of the above factors have had much influence on problems encountered by the LD adult. Due to limited academic and social skills usually demonstrated, the transition process to adulthood has been very difficult (Houck, 1984).

Statement of the Problem

This study compared the beginning work attitude of the nondisabled worker and the beginning work attitude of the LD worker.

Hypothesis

There will be no significant differences in the beginning work attitudes of the LD worker and the nondisabled worker.

Limitations

The groups used for this pilot study were comprised of students from rural Choctaw County, Mississippi, who attended and graduated from the Choctaw County Public Schools. They are from middle to lower socioeconomic backgrounds and may not be representative of students from other areas of the state or the nation.

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

1. Learning disabled (LD)--a heterogeneous group of individuals with normal or near-normal intelligence who have difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, or mathematics. Even though these learning disorders may occur concomitantly with other handicapping conditions, it is not the direct result of these conditions or influences (Houck, 1984).
2. Learning disabled adult--an individual above the age of 18 years who has been diagnosed as being learning disabled.
3. Nondisabled worker--an individual who is considered in the normal range in achievement and abilities according to previous standardized testing.
4. Transition from school to work--the process of adjustment from the school setting to the work (real life) setting.

5. Work attitudes--those feelings, emotions, and behaviors that affect motivation and job performance.

Review of the Literature

An extensive review of the literature revealed little information related to the topic of beginning work attitudes and job satisfaction with regard to the handicapped--especially the learning disabled. Therefore, five major areas related to this topic were reviewed and provide the basis for this study. These areas include: (a) the historical review of the perceptions of the LD individual; (b) legislation related to work adjustment for the handicapped; (c) characteristics associated with hiring practices in our labor markets; (d) the transitional process from school to work; and (e) common problems associated with work adjustment of the handicapped.

Although the concept of "learning disabilities" has had a short history, this concept has often been misunderstood and very often puzzles most people. From the earliest discussions, characterizations of individuals who exhibit what we now call learning disabilities have been varied, and according to Learner (1981), the corresponding parameters for the condition have been elusive.

A closer look at the term "learning disabilities" shows emphasis in many areas. Many terms have been used to describe learning disabilities including such terms as: (a) educational--

"remedial education," "educationally handicapped"; (b) medical--"brain injured," "minimal brain dysfunction"; and (c) psycholinguistic--"language disordered," "psycholinguistic disordered." Some other terms such as "psychoneurological disorders," "reading disabilities," and "problem readers" are also used to describe the field of learning disabilities (Myers & Hammill, 1969).

The first real definition provided (Kirk, 1963) stated that children with learning disabilities exhibit a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using spoken or written language. These may be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic. The child with these problems must not have problems which are due primarily to visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, mental retardation, or to environmental disadvantages. For the most part, components of this definition were incorporated into P.L. 94-142 (1975).

Some characteristic deficits of the LD student, such as (a) attention; (b) cognitive abilities; (c) memory; (d) language related characteristics; and (e) social/interpersonal characteristics, can have a very direct influence on educational and vocational experiences (Houck, 1984). Houck stated that although most studies have considered the young LD student, recent research involving LD adolescents has been conducted. Not much

emphasis, however, has been placed on the older LD individual. One study conducted by the ACLD Vocational Committee on LD Adults (1982) investigated education and employment, living arrangements, social success, social problems associated with LD adults, and possible treatment outcomes.

Houck (1984) stated that more research needs to be focused in the area of the LD adult. Further research has shown that providing services for the LD adult is a high priority need, but little has been done in this area (Lerner, 1981).

Although Lerner (1981) stated that we must provide services for this individual, it is now 1988, and very little has been done. Therefore, it is imperative for much more research to be done in this area.

Although there has been some work done with regard to vocational needs of other disabilities, research has shown that LD adolescents and adults have unique academic, social/personal, and vocational problems that must be dealt with. Moreover, lack of adequate preparation for life and work skills causes many LD adults to have increased difficulties in the transition process (Wallace & McLaughlin, 1988).

Due to common problems associated with vocational adjustment of the handicapped, many laws have been passed to guarantee the rights of the handicapped. P.L. 94-142 (1975), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Sections 503 and 504), the Job Training Partnership

Act of 1982, and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 have all had an impact on education and training of the handicapped.

The law that has had a tremendous impact on our vocational and follow-up services is the Carl Perkins Vocational Act of 1984. The Carl Perkins Act will have a tremendous impact on future studies in dealing with the post-secondary aged handicapped (Sarkees & Scott, 1985).

It is imperative, therefore, to investigate how vocational training can influence work attitudes of handicapped workers. Sarkees and Scott (1985) stated that as the nature of the nation's work force continues to change rapidly, there will be a large demand to train and retrain adults for new jobs. The way that our handicapped population will fit into this picture will depend on the services that are provided.

Changes have occurred in the work force. Kerr and Rosow (1979) stated that individual differences of workers have caused industry to look at ways to provide services for workers. Many factors such as flexible work hours, supported employment, on the job training, redesigning of jobs, etc., have been utilized for both handicapped and nonhandicapped groups. Much more research needs to be conducted in this area as to the effectiveness of these changes.

Research has shown that many barriers exist for the

handicapped as they enter the work force. Brown (1985) and Owens, Arnold, and Coston (1985) identified some of them as: (a) a general negative attitude on the part of the professional community and general public in helping the special needs learner; (b) a lack of interagency and interdisciplinary school collaboration when it comes to service for special needs learners; (c) a problem of transferring written records with regard to "Right of Privacy" legislation; (d) the lack of organized procedures, vocational assessment, and identification of needs of the special needs learner; (e) the general lack of business and industry involvement in transition activities; and (f) inadequate job placement and follow-up services for special needs learners over an extended period of time.

Fardig, Algozzine, Schwartz, Hensel, and Westling (1985) stated that the bulk of the research concerned with post-secondary vocational work adjustment has been with the mildly handicapped and has been conducted in urban areas. Currently, there has been little research done in relation to vocational adjustment of handicapped individuals in rural areas. One study (Schwartz, Hensel, & Westling, 1980) showed that post-secondary adjustment of handicapped students in selected rural areas in Florida is poor. This study used information gathered from 113 former students, or an adult member of their immediate family, on current employment status, position, length of time on the job (months), wages

per hour or per week, and previous employment status. This information was studied to see what similarities existed. It was shown that while some students were making a relatively decent adult adjustment, for the most part, the vocational adjustment programs were poor. According to Fardig et al., the challenge of preparing the handicapped student in rural areas should not be neglected since 67% of all school districts and 33% of all school children live in rural areas.

Wehman, Kregel, and Barcus (1985) stated that handicapped students in most school systems today are not guided into employment opportunities that are appropriate for their abilities. These researchers further state that to a very significant extent, this dearth of systematic vocational transition probably accounts for the continued high unemployment rate of handicapped individuals. In 1983, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights stated that between 50 and 75% of all disabled people were unemployed. In a follow-up study, Mithaug and Horiuchi (1983) indicated that while 60% of the recent special education graduates were working, there was a high level of underemployment and very poor wages.

Vanderoot and McCarthy (1985) stated that young people who are disabled face the same problems and challenges in their transition from school to work that all young people face. The important difference is that the more education and specific skill training one receives, the more likely he is to find a job and the easier

the transition process.

Research has also shown that previous work experiences and personal psychological factors play an important role in job success. Socioeconomic factors are also important and have an impact on work success (Vanderoot & McCarthy, 1985).

Sarkees and Scott (1985) emphasized that one of the greatest challenges we have as service persons working with the handicapped is to insure that the transition process goes smoother and that the worker is able to succeed at his work experience. Research has emphasized that many of the problems special needs learners face in post-secondary experiences can be resolved by adequate counseling and assessment before and during work experience. It is also stated that how the transition is made can mean the difference between a life time of dependency and frustration or a satisfying and productive career (Sarkees & Scott, 1985).

It is imperative, therefore, that we examine beginning work attitudes and how they relate to job satisfaction. Very little research has been done concerning handicapped workers. The areas previously researched have emphasized: (a) job involvement attitudes; (b) work values; and (c) job satisfaction. Again, research has shown that the better prepared the individual is, the higher his chances for success.

O'Toole (1977) discussed how work attitudes are an important factor in job satisfaction and that work attitudes have a direct

correlation to the "hierarchy of needs" of an individual. Betz, Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquist (1968) discussed a study investigating job satisfaction and its relationship to work adjustment.

In this study, Hoppock's Job Satisfaction Blank and the Industrial Center's Employee Attitude Scale were utilized in addition to 22 other items related to job attitudes. A sample using disabled persons and a "control" group of nonhandicapped co-workers was used. This study showed that differences in work attitudes were observed more frequently among the occupational groups than the disabled and control groups. It was stated that the presence or absence of a disability did tend to be more important in determining the level of satisfaction expressed by workers (Betz, Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1968).

Research has shown a direct correlation between motivation and behavior as it relates to job behavior and job satisfaction. It has been shown that the appropriate selection and placement of persons into jobs to fit their needs is very important for job success. O'Toole (1977) stated that attitudes were a crucial variable in occupational success. Hence, since attitudes directly affect behavior, this is a very important area.

O'Toole (1977) stated that employers hire people with whom they can be comfortable. They search for those who share the same values, attitudes, and views of world situations. He further

emphasized that proper work attitudes are necessary for a person to survive in today's world.

Due to this fact, more emphasis should be placed on beginning work attitudes in terms of job retention and satisfaction. According to research, a major problem associated with attitudes concerning the handicapped has been with acceptance by others in work, school, and life situations. In a study by Handlers and Austin (1980), it was demonstrated that some change has occurred in improving attitudes toward the handicapped worker in the school setting.

Vanderoot and McCarthy (1985) noted that the attitudes of the private sector and the employers toward the handicapped are, in some cases, better than those of the professionals working with these individuals. They further stated that professionals need to take a more positive perspective in preparing the handicapped individuals for future work experiences and work expectations since these factors are crucial to work attitudes and job satisfaction.

Wehman, Kregel, and Barcus (1985) discussed how efforts in interagency cooperation between professionals dealing with the handicapped and service sources have produced negative feelings on the part of the employer toward the handicapped. Due to this, much more effort must be made to overcome these obstacles and provide a smooth transition process.

Based on all the above factors, there seems to be a strong need to compare the beginning work attitudes of the nondisabled worker and the LD worker.

Design of the Study

This study compared beginning work attitudes of learning disabled and nondisabled workers to see if any differences exist in the areas of social, emotional, or work ability.

Population

The population was comprised of 30 subjects, all of whom graduated from the Choctaw County Public Schools in 1987 and 1988 and who are presently or have in the past had three months of some type of work experience. Fifteen of the subjects were students who were ruled as LD and were enrolled in classes for specific learning disabilities (SLD) at the time of graduation. Fifteen of the subjects were students enrolled in all regular classes (no outside assistance from any special education or remedial programs) and considered normal in ability and achievement according to previous standardized testing. Both groups were of similar socioeconomic backgrounds.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument utilized for this study, the Beginning Work Rating Scale (see Appendix A) developed by Dorothy Black with assistance from Dr. Jan Gannan and Dr. Lynne Arnault, was used to

determine necessary work behaviors needed in the beginning job placement period. This instrument consists of 40 items categorized under four sections: (a) social/emotional; (b) self-interests; (c) work habits; and (d) work interests.

The items for the study were selected for purposes of considering the needs of the worker as noted in the literature review and from a careful study of the Definitions of Important Work-Related Characteristics (Cordero). The items represented are considered necessary for a successful job placement.

The items are written in a clear, direct manner utilizing a Likert scaling procedure to rate the response to the 40 items. The following scale was used: (1) Not at all; (2) Seldom; (3) Occasionally; (4) Most of the time; (5) All of the time; and NA (does not apply).

Validation of the Instrument

The instrument was reviewed by five authorities from various disciplines to determine construct validity. Some editorial changes were made in order to make the instrument more clear, concise, and consistent with the purpose of the study.

Internal reliability for the instrument was determined by computing alpha coefficients on the 40 items included in the instrument. Initial alpha coefficients on the scale were derived from administering the instrument to students in the sophomore and junior classes at Ackerman High School. After administration of

the instrument, 100 subjects were randomly selected from the entire population (50 sophomore, 50 juniors) resulting in an alpha coefficient of .85.

The instrument was renormed using the 30 subjects of the study. An alpha coefficient of .87 was computed.

Data Collection

In order to locate subjects and gain permission to conduct the study in the Choctaw County Schools, contact was made with the principals of each of the county high schools and with the program director of special education services. Permission was granted for students to participate in the study.

At this point, learning disabled students who had graduated or were to graduate from May, 1987, to May, 1988, were screened and asked if they would participate in the study. For the population of nondisabled students, a random sampling of students from a similar socio-economic setting as the LD students was selected from county high schools. Students were contacted to confirm participation.

After the selection process was concluded, each participant was hand delivered a copy of the instrument. Instructions were given for completion, with each student being told not to put his name on his paper. The instruments were picked up by the researcher at a later time.

Treatment of the Data

The statistical procedures used were the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MONOVA) and the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which were used to compare the differences in beginning work attitudes between LD and nondisabled workers. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to compare the two groups (learning disabled and nondisabled workers) on each component in the categories. As part of this analysis, univariate or analysis of variance was conducted on each of the variables independently.

An alpha level of $\leq .05$ was used as the level of significance. All significance levels below the .05 level indicated a rejection of the null hypothesis, i.e., a statistical difference exists between the two groups in the comparison. The results for each comparison is reported in terms of an F value.

Results and Conclusions

Analysis of Data

The analyses of the data collected through responses to the Beginning Work Rating Scale are reported below. All of the data presented were processed at Mississippi State University. The data are presented in narrative and tabular form.

The purpose of the study was to conduct a pilot study to compare the differences between beginning work attitudes of the nondisabled worker and the LD worker. Usable responses were

received from 30 subjects, which included 15 nondisabled workers and 15 LD workers. Data were analyzed to determine if significant differences existed in the categories of social/emotional; self-evaluation, work habits, and work interests. The multivariate analysis of variance and the univariate one way analysis of variance were used as statistical testing procedures. An alpha level of .05 was selected as the probability of making a type I error.

Table 1 shows a comparison of differences in social/emotional work attitudes between LD workers and nondisabled workers. Three significant differences existed which were: (a) conflicts with co-workers; (b) arguing with other workers; and (c) talking back to the boss when told to do something the worker does not want to do.

Items represented in Table 2 compare differences about self-evaluation between the LD worker and the nondisabled worker. Two items showed significant differences: (a) individual is honest, trustworthy, and respects the property of others; and (b) the individual feels intimidated by others.

Those items represented in Table 3 compare differences in attitudes about work habits between LD workers and nondisabled workers. Only one item showed a significant difference which was missing work often.

Table 4 shows a comparison of differences in attitudes about work interests between LD workers and nondisabled workers. No

Table 1

A Comparison of Differences in Social/Emotional Work Attitudes Between Learning Disabled and Nondisabled Workers

	Group I			Group II				
	No.	$\bar{X}$	SD	No.	$\bar{X}$	SD	df	f
1. I work well with others.	15	4.47	.52	15	4.13	.92	1,28	.2296
2. I am well accepted by my peers.	15	4.00	1.30	15	3.93	.96	1,28	.8713
3. I have conflicts at work with co-workers.	15	1.80	1.37	15	3.27	1.62	1,28	.0125*
4. I argue with other workers.	15	1.53	1.06	15	2.80	1.52	1,28	.0132*
5. I get along well with people of all races.	15	4.13	1.25	15	4.33	.72	1,28	.5951
6. I think I am easy to get along with.	15	4.13	1.25	15	3.87	1.19	1,28	.5533
7. I become upset when someone says I did something wrong.	15	2.47	1.30	15	2.67	1.40	1,28	.6938
8. I get mad at my boss when he scolds me.	15	1.67	1.30	15	2.20	1.26	1,28	.2728
9. I talk back to my boss if he tells me to do something I don't to do.	15	1.06	1.03	15	2.73	1.58	1,28	.0019*
10. I try to do my best to make by boss happy.	15	3.80	1.86	15	4.80	.41	1,28	.0516
11. I try to do whatever my boss tells me to do.	15	3.93	1.67	15	4.20	1.21	1,28	.6198
12. I can change my work habits to fit those expected of me when I am told to do so.	15	3.73	1.22	15	4.26	1.10	1,28	.2195

*$f \leq .05$

Table 2

A Comparison of Differences Between Attitudes about Self-evaluation Between Learning Disabled and Nondisabled Workers

	Group I			Group II				
	No.	X	SD	No.	X	SD	df	f
1. I dress appropriately for my job.	15	4.47	1.30	15	4.47	.83	1,28	1.0000
2. I report to work clean and neat every day.	15	4.47	1.36	15	4.73	.59	1,28	.4910
3. I am not afraid to work around other people.	15	4.13	1.19	15	4.20	1.21	1,28	.8799
4. I am honest, trustworthy, and respect the property of others.	15	4.80	.41	15	4.07	1.10	1,28	.0224*
5. I communicate well will others.	15	4.60	.74	15	4.07	1.03	1,28	.1147
6. I am confident in myself.	15	4.33	.62	15	4.26	.88	1,28	.8124
7. I become frustrated easily.	15	2.40	.91	15	3.20	1.26	1,28	.0566
8. I feel intimidated by others.	15	2.47	.92	15	3.60	1.35	1,28	.0120*
9. I am afraid of failure.	15	2.33	1.35	15	3.20	1.57	1,28	.1154
10. I worry about things I can't control.	15	3.20	.86	15	3.27	1.33	1,28	.8721

*$f \leq .05$

Table 3

A Comparison of Differences in Attitudes About Work Habits Between Learning Disabled and Nondisabled Workers

	Group I			Group II				
	No.	$\bar{X}$	SD	No.	$\bar{X}$	SD	df	f
1. I work at a steady speed on most jobs.	15	4.20	.56	15	4.53	.90	1,28	.6300
2. I follow directions.	15	4.53	.52	15	4.53	.64	1,28	1.0000
3. I complete jobs given to me in the time allowed.	15	4.07	1.22	15	4.53	.52	1,28	.1842
4. I try to do my best on any task I am told to do.	15	4.47	.74	15	4.53	.83	1,28	.8189
5. Neatness is important to me in my work.	15	4.13	1.41	15	4.27	1.10	1,28	.7746
6. I stay at my assigned work station.	15	4.13	1.41	15	4.13	.64	1,28	1.0000
7. I compare my work to that of others.	15	2.93	1.44	15	3.40	1.50	1,28	.3921
8. I get to work on time.	15	3.67	1.68	15	4.40	1.12	1,28	.1700
9. I take breaks at the proper time.	15	4.07	1.71	15	4.53	.74	1,28	.3406
10. I call my supervisor if I am sick or will be late for work.	15	4.20	1.32	15	4.47	.83	1,28	.5137
11. I return from breaks at the proper time.	15	4.33	1.29	15	4.27	1.10	1,28	.8801
12. I often miss work.	15	1.60	.83	15	3.13	1.51	1,28	.0018*

*$f \leq .05$

Table 4

A Comparison of Differences in Attitudes about Work Interests Between Learning Disabled and Nondisabled Workers

	Group I			Group II				
	No.	$\bar{X}$	SD	No.	$\bar{X}$	SD	df	f
1. I look for other jobs to do when I finish my tasks.	15	3.13	1.41	15	2.80	1.79	1,28	.5741
2. I love my job and am excited about it.	15	3.33	1.76	15	3.07	1.83	1,28	.6873
3. I would like to work longer hours than I work.	15	2.80	1.57	15	3.13	1.88	1,28	.6026
4. I take pride in my work.	15	3.93	1.33	15	2.93	1.58	1,28	.0716
5. I want to learn more about my job.	15	3.47	1.60	15	3.40	1.64	1,28	.9110
6. I want to use this job as a way to get a better job.	15	3.87	1.92	15	3.27	1.79	1,28	.3840

*$r \leq .05$

significant differences were shown.

Conclusions

This pilot study showed that few significant differences existed when comparing beginning work attitudes of the LD worker and the nondisabled worker in the areas of social/emotional, self-evaluation, work habits, and work interests. This is very interesting since much of the previous research done in this area indicated that many significant differences do exist between the LD individual and nondisabled individual--especially in the areas of social/emotional and vocational (work habits and work interests). However, the findings revealed that LD workers displayed characteristics that may well be sources of unsuccessful job placement and performance. These characteristics include: (a) conflicts with co-workers; (b) arguing with co-workers; (c) talking back to the supervisor; (d) frequent absenteeism; and (e) job frustrations. These results support the findings of O'Toole (1977) and others which may explain some of the difficulties encountered by the LD worker in job placement and performance.

Therefore, it seems imperative that much more research be conducted in this area. Emphasis in future studies should be placed on comparing: (a) differences in work attitudes between disabled and nondisabled workers in rural and metropolitan settings; (b) comparing differences in beginning work attitudes between LD workers in rural and metropolitan settings; and (c)

comparing differences in beginning work attitudes between the LD worker and the nondisabled worker on a statewide basis.

APPENDIX A

Beginning Work Rating Scale

Beginning Work Rating Scale

Rate the behavior items as follows:

1 - Not at all
2 - Seldom
3 - Occasionally
4 - Most of the time
5 - All of the time
NA - Does not apply

Social-Emotional

With Co-workers

1. I work well with others.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I am well accepted by my peers.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I have conflicts at work with co-workers.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. I argue with other workers.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

5. I get along well with people of all races.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

6. I think I am easy to get along with.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

With Authority Figures

1. I become upset when someone says I did something wrong.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I get mad at my boss when he scolds me.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I talk back to my boss if he tells me to do something I don't want to do.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. I try to do whatever my boss tells me to do.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

5. I try to do my best to make my boss happy.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

6. I can change my work habits to fit those expected of me when I am told to do so.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Self-Evaluation

1. I dress appropriately for my job.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I report to work clean and neat every day.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I am not afraid to work around other people.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. I am honest, trustworthy, and respect the property of others.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

5. I communicate well with others.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

6. I am confident in myself.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

7. I become frustrated easily.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

8. I feel intimidated by others.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

9. I am afraid of failure.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

10. I worry about things I can't control.

    1 2 3 4 5 NA

Work Habits

1. I work at a steady speed on most jobs.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I follow directions.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I complete jobs given to me in the time allowed.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. I try to do my best on any task I am told to do.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

5. Neatness is important to me in my work.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

6. I stay at my assigned work station.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

7. I compare my work to that of others.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Punctuality

1. I get to work on time.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I take breaks at the proper time.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I return from breaks at the proper time.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. I call my supervisor if I am sick or will be late for work.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

5. I often miss work.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Work Interest

1. I look for other jobs to do when I finish my tasks.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I love my job and am excited about it.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I would like to work longer hours than I work.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. I take pride in my work.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

5. I want to learn more about my job.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

6. I want to use this job as a way to get a better job.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

References

Alley, G., & Deshler, D. (1979). Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: Strategies and methods. Denver, CO: Love.

Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities. (1982, September/October). ACLD vocational committee survey of learning disabled adults: Preliminary report. ACLD Newsbriefs, 10-13.

Betz, E., Weiss, D. J., Davis, R., England, C. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1968). The concept of work adjustment. In D. Zytowski (Ed.), Vocational behavior (pp. 443-449). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Brown, J. M. (1985, January). A model for enhancing the transition of mildly handicapped youth into post-secondary vocational education. Interchange, 2-6.

Cordero, J. Definition of important work related characteristics. Department of Special Education, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Public Law 94-142, 89 Stat. 775, 20 U.S.C.A. Section 1401 et.seg. (Nov. 29, 1975).

Fardig, D., Algozzine, R., Schwartz, S., Hensel, J., & Westling, D. (1985). Post-secondary vocational adjustment of rural, mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 52(2),115-121.

Handlers, A., & Austin, K. (1980). Improving attitudes of high school students towards their learning disabled peers. Exceptional Child, 47(3), 228-229.

Houck, C. (1984). Learning disabilities: Understanding concepts, characteristics, and issues. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentiss-Hall.

Kerr, C., & Rosow, J. (1979). Work in America: The decade ahead. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Kirk, S. (1963). Behavioral diagnosis and remediation of learning disabilities. Conference on Exploration into the Problems of the Perceptually Handicapped Child, 1-7. Evanston, IL: Fund for the Perceptually Handicapped Child.

Lerner, J. (1981). Learning disabilities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Mithaug, D., & Horiuchi, C. (1983). Colorado statewide follow-up of special education students. Denver, CO: Colorado State Department of Education.

Myers, P., & Hamill, D. (1969). Methods of learning disorders. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

O'Toole, J. (1977). Work, learning, and the American future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Owens, D., Arnold, K., & Coston, C. (1985). Supporting transition to post-secondary vocational training programs. Journal for Vocational Special Needs, 7(2), 25-27.

Sarkees, M., & Scott, J. (1985). Vocational special needs. Homewood, IL: American Technical Publishers.

Schwartz, S., Hensel, J., & Westling, D. (1980). Evaluation of the vocational preparation and success of handicapped individuals who reside in rural areas: A continuation report. Tallahassee, FL: Department of Education.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1983). Accommodating the spectrum of disabilities. Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Vanderoot, D., & McCarthy, H. (1985). Moving from school to work. The Exceptional Parent, 15(3), 19-21.

Wallace, G., & McLaughlin, J. (1988). Learning disabilities, concepts and characteristics. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Barcus M. (1985). From school to work: A vocational transition model for handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 52(1), 25-37.